

06/13/19 Roadless cooperating agency meeting

Cooperating Agencies: **OVKasaan** (Marina Anderson, Paula Peterson) **Hydaburg Cooperative Association** (Cathy Needham, Anthony Christianson) **OVKake** (Joel Jackson) **Hoonah Indian Association** (Robert Starbard)

USFS: Melinda Hernandez Burke (Tribal Relations), Nicole Grewe (Community Engagement), Ken Tu (Team Lead), Robin Dale (Roadless Team), Sitka Pence (Roadless Team), Robert Nichols (Roadless Team), Stephanie Rust (Roadless Team), Chad VanOrmer (Roadless Team Lead)

Melinda did a roll call to open up the meeting

Ken: purpose of the call: Letter sent out informing of the potential that we will be rolling out with notice of availability of EIS and federal register notice of proposed rule. Heads up on materials provided to you and to tribes and ANCs. This is an opportunity for the cooperating agencies to ask questions about what what was sent out

- Newest info in material: identification by the Secretary of 2 proposed rules. This is somewhat unusual. Typically we go out with 1, but we had 6 alternatives and the Secretary wanted to narrow the focus of the proposed rulemaking onto the range that he felt was where he wanted to end up. That was somewhere between alternatives 3-4. Comments will be accepted on all alternatives and anything else not present on the list.
- Definitions and purpose were not included in what we sent out this week—it was a lot of materials and wanted to allow for the pertinent information to be focused on. Purpose and need document: you have seen it before. It was in the draft EIS.
- Enclosure 3: will be included in definitions section—these are the roadless area characteristics. We took the roadless team area characteristics and the ones from the Citizens Advisory Committee and merged them together—that is what you see in that enclosure. A new revamped AK roadless area characteristics.
- Enclosure 4: roadless land management categories applied to the various alternatives—a description of those. Community area priorities as well—and it is acknowledged we did not apply that to Hydaburg and Kake. It will be captured between draft and final.
- Enclosures 6-11 are the maps for each alternative.

Questions:

- Tony: You have stated and acknowledged the omission--will that get rolled into the draft document once published, or do we have to do public comment to ensure the community use areas are injected? They changed a bit—when we supported 3. We appreciate the assurances that will be in there, and it will be noted in the register and will be injected to the plan moving forward.
  - Ken: you will not have to comment to get it incorporated, unless you want to. We will apply the Community Use Priority Area (CUPA) to Hydaburg and Kake unless there is a huge reason we cannot. We sent draft maps out to you on how we think we would

apply that. Lines may not align with where you think they should be—we will take comments on that and consider it.

- Nicole: the map is our best shot. You can provide comment, and we stated that this is our starting point and whether or not it met your vision and needs.
  - Tony: we will look at that and provide further feedback, glad we still have time to look at the information and get input back to the team
- Joel: we brought up the fact that our CUPA is very small compared to our traditional territory. You said you are only using a map that was available to you. We want to ensure the updated one we submitted a while back is the one being used.
  - Ken: we have seen the map of your traditional use area. Will be difficult to apply the CUPA to the entire map, mainly because it is so big.
    - Joel: you are going to have to consider that. Even before motorized boats, our territory was large. Goldschmidt and Haas book was stamped by state of Alaska. We are not being greedy—it is our area.
      - Ken: The CUPA is not meant to be a reflection of your traditional territory. It is a mgmt. allocation of where we can apply it for some community concerns and issues. We would not apply too broadly, because it is less restrictive than our roadless priority. We are trying to balance the preservation of roadless area characteristics while providing some economic opportunities.
    - Joel: you gave Hyder a bigger traditional use area and they are not a traditional community. You expanded theirs to double what ours is. Discriminatory in our book.
      - Ken: maps are a starting point. We can figure out where those lines should be, but I am confident the Secretary would not apply that priority to all of your traditional territory area.
        - Joel: once it goes into the Secretary, we can't change anything. I understand what you are saying, but we need to state our objection to it and sit down to talk to you about this. **\*Follow-up meeting to be planned\***
          - Nicole: will note the objection again. We've had lots of conversation about this. The G&H book...thought we were going to reference it somehow in the project record. It is difficult to accommodate the large area the 1955 map encompasses (territory) where the use area is intensity of use. There will be movement on some of this between DEIS and EIS. You have been heard, and it is reflected in the record (G&H information and reflection of territories)
  - Cathy: you said the maps will be updated by the time the draft goes out?
    - Ken: no. We did say in draft EIS that we should have applied CUPA to Kake and Hydaburg and that they were inadvertently missed.
    - Cathy: we would have similar comment to Kake. The use area identified by state is not Hydaburg traditional territory. Since the map doesn't show it, we don't know what areas

and watershed will be included. If we could get that overlay and visual, that would be useful to have during the comment period. What about other cooperating agencies that made comment about protections around their communities?

- Ken: we did not see a specific request to apply something like this to their communities. Does not preclude it for the future. If they like what they see in terms of the applications and restrictions on it, they can ask for it during the comment period and it would be applied between draft and final. Hydaburg map: \*\*Re-send out the 2 maps to Hydaburg and Kake. Done 6/14/19
  - Nicole: it was after when we realized we made the error. We added a 5<sup>th</sup> category—and we had to figure out a fair and uniform boundary area. But that was the starting place based on what we had available: logical starting place.
- Joel: we have been asking for an extension and we still want that. We have sent letter to Secretary Purdue and others requesting that.
  - Ken: timeline out of our hands, but I can tell you an extension is probably unlikely. Final rule due out June 2020 or earlier. I don't have discretion on the end date.
    - Joel: want to restate that for the record.
- Paula: OVKasaan Tribal council meeting next Thursday-we will provide comment after we have been able to brief the full Council

Joel:

\*\*Hydaburg also wants in person meeting. Date TBD

\*\*Melinda provided some additional info about Monday's letter.

Next Meeting: Thursday, June 27<sup>th</sup>